



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,109	04/19/2004	John C. Knopp	1546.133US02	1443

24113 7590 08/08/2005

PATTERSON, THUENTE, SKAAR & CHRISTENSEN, P.A.
4800 IDS CENTER
80 SOUTH 8TH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-2100

EXAMINER

NORMAN, MARC E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3744

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/827,109

Applicant(s)

KNOPP, JOHN C.

Examiner

Marc E. Norman

Art Unit

3744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 11-23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-10,24-26 and 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4,27 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/19/04; 11/19/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6-10 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

At claim 6, lines 6-7, Applicant recites the parameter being sensed proximate the evaporator *outlet*. However, Applicant's invention as described in the specification and shown in the drawings is directed to sensing a temperature parameter at the *entrance* to the evaporator (see location of sensor A in Figures 1 and 2). Due to this discrepancy, Applicant appears to be claiming something other than the disclosed invention. Accordingly, claim 6 (and claims 7-10 which depend from claim 6) have not been examined on the merits at this time.

Claim 30 recites the limitation "said return line" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Furthermore, the base claim already recites the temperature sensing as taking place in the supply line. The sensor cannot be in two places at once. Also, similar to the discussion above, Applicant's invention as described in the specification and shown in the drawings is directed to sensing a temperature parameter at the *entrance* to the evaporator. Accordingly, claim 30 has not been examined on the merits at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enterline et al.

As per claims 1 and 24-26 and 29, Enterline et al. discloses a method for detecting surge in refrigeration system (see title/abstract) comprising a centrifugal compressor 12 and evaporator 14 having heat exchange relation with a liquid (as part of chiller system) wherein a fluid temperature TT_2 is measured at a supply line to the evaporator and a refrigerant temperature TT_3 is measured proximate the compressor entrance, and the sensed temperatures being input into the control logic that determines and controls compressor output and surge (Figures 2-4). Enterline et al. does not specifically teach the compressor having an impeller, however official notice is taken that impellers are common and well-known features of centrifugal compressors that would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 3744

combine with the compressor of Enterline et al. for the purpose of imparting a compressive force on the refrigerant.

As per claim 31, base claim 24 already recites the temperature being sensed at the compressor entrance. To the extent (as shown in Applicant's Figures 1 and 2) that sensor A is considered to be near the impeller, so would similarly located sensor TT₃ of Enterline et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4, 27, and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 5 and 11-23 are allowed.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 571-272-4812. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on 571-272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN



MARC NORMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER